



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,543	10/24/2001	Kristopher Allyn Klink	PU000147	5966

7590 05/17/2005

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI  
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.  
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY  
P.O. BOX 5312  
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/003,543	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KRISTOPHER ALLYN KLINK	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeff Piziali	<b>Art Unit</b> 2673	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,13-20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,13-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 January 2005 has been entered.

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings were received on 24 October 2001. These drawings are acceptable.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 13-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. All independent claims were amended (Paper No. 4, filed 14 April 2004) to recite such limitations as *buffering a pixel row and detecting if the buffered pixel row has all*

---

Art Unit: 2673

*unused pixels* (see Claim 1), *storing a pixel row in a buffer and detecting if the stored pixel row contains substantially all unused pixels* (see Claim 13, amended 26 January 2005), as well as a *buffer for storing pixel rows and a controller detecting whether pixel rows stored in the buffer contains all unused pixels* (see Claim 15). No such explicit pixel row buffer detection techniques are discussed anywhere in the pending specification. The instant specification mentions, "A conventional method of accessing the imager array is done by addressing each pixel by first shifting a row of analog pixel elements into a sample and hold buffer 22 (s/h buffer) and then transferring these voltages to the appropriate pixels during a row access latch" (see Page 4, Lines 2-5). However, the specification never discloses buffering a pixel row and then detecting the buffered pixel row contents in order to determine whether LCD rows should then be driven with video signals or a common black signal.

### ***Specification***

5. The amendment filed 26 January 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The s/h buffer 22 is coupled to the controller 23 to enable the controller 23 to detect if a row of pixels buffered in s/h buffer 22 has all unused pixels" (see page 2 of the amendment). Originally submitted claim 21 (now canceled) recited, "a sample and hold circuit coupled to the random access controller to enable the random access controller to detect rows having all unused pixels." Claim 21 neglected to specify the sample and hold circuit being constituted by a "s/h buffer." Moreover, claim 21 did not specify

---

Art Unit: 2673

detecting if a row of pixels *buffered in s/h buffer 22* has all unused pixels -- it merely spoke to detecting rows having all unused pixels. Being that the random access controller is also coupled to a row address selector [Fig. 2; 24] (see also originally submitted claim 15), one skilled in the art would not have been able to determine (from the originally submitted specification and claims) that controller [Fig. 2; 23] necessarily detects if a row of pixels *buffered in s/h buffer* [Fig. 2; 22] has all unused pixels.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3, 6, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kitagawa (US 5,844,539).

Regarding claim 1, Kitagawa discloses a method of reducing a column clock [Fig. 3; VCK] time in a liquid crystal display [Fig. 1; 3] (see Column 1, Lines 5-10 and Column 4, Lines 1-22), comprising the steps of: buffering [Fig. 1; 1 & 2 operating in conjunction] a pixel row; detecting if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 32]; driving all pixels on a corresponding imager row [Figs. 2B & 2C; 37] to black [Fig. 3; VBLK] simultaneously if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels; and transferring the buffered pixel row to the

---

Art Unit: 2673

corresponding imager row if the buffered pixel row has used pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 36] (see Fig. 4; Column 6, Line 54 - Column 7, Line 63).

Regarding claim 2, Kitagawa discloses the pixels on the corresponding imager row are driven to black by applying a common DC voltage [Fig. 3; VBLK] to the imager row (see Column 6, Lines 40-53).

Regarding claim 3, Kitagawa discloses the steps of driving all pixels on the corresponding imager row comprises the steps of switching all pixels on the imager row to a first voltage [Fig. 4; VBLK high] during the negative phase of a pixel and switching all pixels on the imager row to a second voltage [Fig. 4; VBLK low] during a positive phase of the pixel (see Fig. 4; Column 7, Lines 37-63).

Regarding claim 6, Kitagawa discloses the method further comprises the step of randomly accessing a start of a plurality of rows in the liquid crystal display (see Column 3, Lines 37-45). Where the row access is inherently randomly determined (note the blanked row 37 just below the display region 36 in Figs. 2B & 2C for instance) by the video signal resolution to be displayed.

Regarding claim 13, Kitagawa discloses a method of reducing a column clock [Fig. 3; VCK] time in a liquid crystal display [Fig. 1; 3] (see Column 1, Lines 5-10 and Column 4, Lines 1-22), comprising the steps of: randomly accessing a row in a liquid crystal display imager (see

---

Art Unit: 2673

Column 3, Lines 37-45 -- where row access is inherently randomly determined by the video signal resolution to be displayed) having a plurality of rows (see Fig. 2A); storing a pixel row in a buffer [Fig. 1; 1 & 2 operating in conjunction], the stored pixel row corresponding to the randomly accessed row; detecting if the stored pixel row contains substantially all unused pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 32]; selectively addressing the randomly accessed row if the stored pixel row contains active video pixels and avoiding addressing the randomly accessed row [Figs. 2B & 2C; 37] if the stored pixel row contains substantially all unused pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 32] (see Fig. 5; Column 7, Lines 64 - Column 8, Line 27).

Regarding claim 14, Kitagawa discloses the steps of driving all pixels in an avoided row to black by switching all pixels on the avoided row to a first voltage [Fig. 5; VBLK high] during a negative phase of the given pixel and switching all pixels on the avoided row to a second voltage [Fig. 5; VBLK low] during a positive phase of the pixel (see Column 7, Lines 64 - Column 8, Line 27).

Regarding claim 15, Kitagawa discloses a liquid crystal display imager system [Fig. 1; 3] (see Column 1, Lines 5-10 and Column 4, Lines 1-22), comprises: a buffer [Fig. 1; 1 & 2 operating in conjunction] for storing pixel rows; a row address selector [Figs. 1 & 3; 33]; an imager having a plurality of rows (see Fig. 2A), the imager being coupled to the buffer and the row address selector; and a random access controller [Fig. 1; 4 working in conjunction with the SYNC signal] coupled to the buffer and the row address selector, the controller detects whether pixel rows stored in the buffer contains all unused pixels, and avoids addressing corresponding

---

Art Unit: 2673

rows in the imager if stored pixel rows having all unused pixels are detected (see Fig. 5; Column 7, Lines 64 - Column 8, Line 27). Where row access is inherently randomly determined (note the blanked row 37 just below the display region 36 in Figs. 2B & 2C for instance) by the video signal resolution to be displayed.

Regarding claim 16, Kitagawa discloses the liquid crystal display imager system further comprises a switching mechanism [Fig. 3; PSW1 - PSWN] that drives all pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 32] on a given imager row [Figs. 2B & 2C; 37] to black simultaneously if the corresponding row in the buffer has all unused pixels (see Column 6, Lines 1-53).

Regarding claim 17, Kitagawa discloses the row address selector progresses through all rows of the imager and the switching mechanism simultaneously drives all pixels on any imager row to black if the corresponding row in the buffer has all unused pixels until a row with active video [Figs. 2B & 2C; 36] is detected in the buffer (see Fig. 5; Column 7, Lines 64 - Column 8, Line 27).

Regarding claim 18, Kitagawa discloses the switching mechanism drives the pixels on the imager row to black by applying a common DC voltage [Fig. 3; VBLK] to the imager row (see Column 6, Lines 40-53)

Regarding claim 19, Kitagawa discloses the switching mechanism drives all pixels on a given imager row to black by switching all pixels on the given imager row to a first voltage [Fig.

---



5; VBLK high] during the negative phase of a pixel and switches all pixels on the given imager row to a second voltage [Fig. 5; VBLK low] during a positive phase of the pixel until the row address selector reaches an active video row (see Column 7, Lines 64 - Column 8, Line 27).

Regarding claim 20, Kitagawa discloses the row address selector operates at a faster speed while incrementing through imager rows having all pixels being driven to black and operates at a slower speed while incrementing through imager rows having active video (see Fig. 4; Column 7, Lines 37-63).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitagawa (US 5,844,539) in view of Fairbanks et al. (US 5,130,703).

Regarding claim 5, Kitagawa does not explicitly disclose the first voltage is 16 volts and the second voltage is 0 volts. However, Fairbanks does disclose driving a liquid crystal display (see Column 1, Lines 5-10) with a first voltage of 16 volts and a second voltage of 0 volts (see Column 3, Line 61 - Column 4, Line 9). Kitagawa and Fairbanks are analogous art, because they are from the shared field of driving liquid crystal display devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Fairbanks' voltage levels with

Art Unit: 2673

Kitagawa's clock time reduction method and circuitry, so as to optimize screen contrast and picture quality.

10. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitagawa (US 5,844,539) in view of Huang et al. (US 5,965,907).

Regarding claim 22, Kitagawa does not explicitly disclose the system is for a liquid crystal on silicon crystal display. However, Huang does disclose substituting an active matrix LCD with a liquid crystal on silicon crystal display (see Column 4, Lines 46-67). Kitagawa and Huang are analogous art, because they are from the shared field of liquid crystal display devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Huang's LCoS display as Kitagawa's LCD, so as to utilize a display that is relatively easy and inexpensive to manufacture.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 26 January 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is in error, because support for the disputed subject matter is found in original claim 21. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Originally submitted claim 21 (now canceled) recited, "a sample and hold circuit coupled to the random access controller to enable the random access controller to detect rows having all unused pixels." Claim 21 did not specify detecting if a row of pixels *buffered in s/h buffer* 22 has all unused pixels -- it merely spoke to detecting rows having all unused pixels. Seeing that the random access controller is also coupled to a row

---

Art Unit: 2673

address selector [Fig. 2; 24] (see also originally submitted claim 15), one skilled in the art would not have been able to determine (from the originally submitted specification and claims) that controller [Fig. 2; 23] necessarily detects if a row of pixels *buffered/stored in sample and hold buffer* [Fig. 2; 22] has all unused pixels.

Additionally, the applicant contends the cited prior art of Kitagawa (US 5,844,539) neglects to disclose detecting if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels; driving all pixels on a corresponding imager row to black simultaneously if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels; and transferring the buffered pixel row to the corresponding imager row if the buffered pixel row has used pixels. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. On the contrary, Kitagawa discloses buffering [Fig. 1; 1 & 2 operating in conjunction] a pixel row; detecting if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 32]; driving all pixels on a corresponding imager row [Figs. 2B & 2C; 37] to black [Fig. 3; VBLK] simultaneously if the buffered pixel row has all unused pixels; and transferring the buffered pixel row to the corresponding imager row if the buffered pixel row has used pixels [Figs. 2B & 2C; 36] (see Fig. 4; Column 6, Line 54 - Column 7, Line 63). Kitagawa explicitly states, "The vertical scanning circuit 33 sequentially selects rows of the pixels 32 formed in the screen 31. The horizontal scanning circuit 34 sequentially distributes [i.e. buffers] the video signals VSIG supplied from the main-driver 1 to rows of the pixels 32, and writes the distributed signals into the selected pixels 32" (see Column 4, Lines 29-34).

The applicant concedes, "Kitagawa appears to teach identifying the resolution of a received video signal (e.g. XGA, SVGA or VGA) and using the identified resolution to determine whether blank regions will exist when the received video is displayed" (see Pages 8-9

---

Art Unit: 2673

of the Amendment). It is the examiner's respectful position that *identifying the resolution of a received video signal* inherently necessitates detecting if a pixel row has used or unused pixels.

By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



12 May 2005



**BIPIN SHALWALA**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**